DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 179 189 IR 007 033

AUTHOR Goldhor, Herbert
TITLE A Study of Public Library Book Collections in the Humanities.
INSTITUTION Illinois Univ., Urbana. Graduate School of Library Science.
PUB DATE Jan 79
NOTE 51p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Books; *Evaluation; *Humanities; *Library Collections; Nonfiction; *Public Libraries

ABSTRACT

Undertaken to secure hard data on the nature and extent of American public library holdings of adult non-fiction books in the humanities, this study of 19 library collections of varying sizes used an inductive approach for evaluating books based on the frequency of their citation in selected reference tools. Five points summarize the findings: (1) 11 percent of the public libraries' total book holdings consists of adult non-fiction books in the humanities, or 15 percent of adult books and 22 percent of adult non-fiction held; (2) 50 percent of the titles analyzed were listed in three or more of the tools, 32 percent were found in one or two tools, and 16 percent were in none; (3) three-fourths of all the books noted were on literature and history, ranking as high or higher in quality than those in other subject areas; (4) libraries serving less than 25,000 persons compared well with those of other sizes; and (5) 70 percent of all titles held were published in the last 20 years. Tables detail the composition of the collections sampled and the distribution of their titles. (FM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED179189

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A STUDY OF PUBLIC LIBRARY BOOK COLLECTIONS IN THE HUMANITIES

by

Herbert Goldhor

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Herbert Goldhor

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

IR007033

Library Research Center, University of Illinois Graduate School of Library Science
Urbana, IL 61801

A Study of Public Library Book Collections in the Humanities

By Herbert Goldhor

(revised final report: January 1979)

Table of Contents

Sec. 1. Introduction 1

Sec. 2. Methodology Used in This Study 1

Sec. 3. The Extent of Holdings in the Humanities in the Sample Libraries . . . 6

Sec. 4. The Composition of Library Holdings of Adult Books in the Humanities . 8

Sec. 5. The Sample of Titles in General. 11

Sec. 6. The Quality of the Sample Titles 14

Sec. 7. Further Analyses of the Sample of Titles 25
A. Titles Found in None of the Tools 25
B. By Date of Publication. 26
C. By Number of Duplicate Copies 29
D. Of the Titles with Negative Reviews 31
E. Of the Use of the Different Tools 31
F. Comparative Data by Subject 34

Sec. 8. Summary. 35

Footnotes 38

Appendix 1. Dewey Decimal Classes for Subject Areas in the Humanities as Used in This Study. 39

List of Tables

1. Percentage Composition by State of Public Library Book Collections. 2

2. Distribution by Population Served of All US Public Libraries and of Those Libraries in the Final and Net Samples of This Study 3

3. Distribution by Size Group of the Projected and Actual Number of Titles in the Humanities Used for Analysis 5

4. Percentage Composition of the Book Collections of the Public Libraries in the Net Sample, by Size Group. 6

5. Percentage Composition of Adult Non-Fiction Books in the Humanities by Subject for Each Size Group of Libraries in the Net Sample. 9

6. Percentage Distribution of the Sample of Titles by Dewey Class Number, and in Comparison with Estimated Total Holdings, for Each Size Group. . . 13

7. Percentage Distribution of Titles Searched by the Number of Tools in Which the Titles Were Found Listed, for Each Subject and by Size Group of Libraries. 16

8. Summary Percentage Distribution of the Number of Tools in Which the Sample Titles Were Found Listed, by Major Subjects and for Each Size Group. 23

9. Percentage Distribution by Main Dewey Decimal Classes of Titles Found in No Tools and of All Titles Analyzed 26

10. Percentage Distribution by Time Periods of the Sample Titles Analyzed in This Study, for Each Main Subject and by Size Group of Libraries 27

11. Distribution of Titles Analyzed in This Study and Published in 1972-76, by Subject and for Each Size Group of Libraries, in Comparison with Total US Book Production in These Subjects in These Years 29

12. Distribution by Size Group of Libraries of the Number of Titles Analyzed and of Their Additional Copies 30

13. Percentage Distribution by Book Selection Tool of All Listings Found for the 6412 Titles, for Each Size Group of Libraries 33

14. Estimated Total Number of Adult Titles Reviewed or Listed in Each Tool for up to Ten Years, by Main Subject Areas of the Humanities. 34

15. Spearman Coefficients of Rank Correlation for the Four Size Groups of Libraries Between the Dewey Classes Shown in Regard to the Percentage of Titles (A) Found on No List, and (B) Found on Three or More Lists. . . 35

16. Percentage Distribution of Titles in Three Studies Using the Inductive Method of Evaluating the Book Collections of Public Libraries 36

Sec. 1. Introduction

This is the report of a study of the nature and extent of US public library holdings of adult non-fiction books in the humanities in 1977 (1). For the purposes of this study, the definition of the humanities which is used by the National Endowment for the Humanities was accepted, viz., modern and classical languages, linguistics, literature, history, jurisprudence, philosophy, archaeolgy, comparative religion, ethics, and the history, criticism and theory of the arts. This study covers only adult non-fiction books (both reference and circulating copies), and does not consider periodicals, music scores, audiovisual or other materials. In spite of the availability of a large body of data on American public libraries, practically no information was found in the existing literature of recent years on the details of the book collections of one or more American public libraries. Only two relevant studies - ten and more years old - were found; together they gave figures on the holdings of 20 small Pennsylvania public libraries by the ten main groups of the Dewey decimal classification (2).

In addition, one study reported 1957/58 data for 185 US public libraries (each serving 35,000 people or more), on the percentage juvenile books were of total book stock; the median was 29%, and the mean 31% (3). Three sub-groups by population size were all very close to these total averages; but 35 county public libraries, serving 50,000 or more people each, had a median and mean of 44%. Some recent data are available from earlier studies done by the Library Reserach Center, on the gross percentages of juvenile and adult books in American public libraries. Statistics on public libraries, compiled and published by 44 state library agencies for report years ending in 1974, had been indexed in depth; five states reported figures on the composition of book stock and provided state totals, as shown in Table 1. Another report by the Library Research Center describes the results from 66 Illinois public libraries (all but one serving less than 100,000 people each), of the application in 1975 of the performance measures suggested by DeProspo and others (4). One of these measures was the percentage distribution of the collection by adult and juvenile books, For all 66 libraries, juvenile books were 32% of the total; for 36 libraries serving fewer than 20,000 people each, juvenile books were 35% of the total, and for 30 libraries serving more than 20,000 persons each, they were 28% (5).

Sec. 2. Methodology Used in This Study

In order to make an estimate of the quality of the books held by US public libraries in the humanities, it was decided to use the inductive method of evaluation (6). Briefly this method consists of taking a sample of titles held by one or more libraries, and ascertaining whether each such title is or is not listed

Table 1. Percentage Composition by State of Public Library Book Collections

(a) State	(b) Composition of Collections Juvenile	(c) Adult	(d) Number of Libraries Represented
New York	22%	78%	711
North Carolina	30	70	99
North Dakota	38	62	76
Tennessee	29	71	177
West Virgina	29	71	66
Total			1129
Average	29.6%	70.4%	

Note: The average of juvenile books after weighting each percentage with the number of libraries in the state, summing, and dividing by 1129, is 25%.

Sources: NY State Library, Division of Library Development, Public and Association Statistics/ 1974 (1975) p. 84; NC Division of State Library, Statistics of North Carolina Public Libraries: July 1, 1973 - June 30, 1974 (1974) p. 10-12; ND State Library Commission, "North Dakota Public Library Statistics July 1973-June 1974," North Dakota Library Notes 6 (July 1975) p. 4; Tennessee State Library and Archives, Public Libraries Section, Tennessee Public Library Statistics: July 1, 1973 - June 30, 1974 (1974) p. 5, 18, 20; West Virginia Library Commission, 1974 Statistical Report (1975) p. 10.

in each of several relevant book reviewing tools or retrospective bibliographies. Those titles found in all or most such bibliographies are likely to be valuable and desirable books; those found in only one to two such tools are probably of lesser quality; and those found in none of the lists are of questionable value or are local publications. The first step therefore was to pick a sample of libraries from which to secure data on the composition of the book stock and also a set of titles to be analyzed in the manner just described.

In view of the time and resources available, a national sample of 20 libraries was planned, divided into four main size groups by population served (see Table 2). The sample was drawn in the following manner. Twenty random numers from 1 to 50 were generated and assigned in reverse order to the size groups in the sample, directing us to the appropriate states when listed alphabetically. Starting with the first page of each state's listing in the American Library Directory, we chose the first public library in the size group in question; if no library in that state qualified, we went on alternately to the next successive and last previous states. As appropriate libraries were identified, the director of each was sent a letter inviting his/her cooperation in the study and offering to pay a local representative (chosen by the director) to gather the needed data. For 8 of the 20 cases, we had to go back to the American Library Directory, sometimes because shelflists were not organized in the manner necessary for this

Table 2. Distribution by Population Served of All US Public Libraries and of Those Libraries in the Final and Net Samples of This Study

(see below for column headings)

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)	(j)
A	Up to 25,000	82%	28%	6	30%	3%	6	32%	3%
B	25,000-99,999	14	26	5	25	6	4	21	5
C	100,000-499,999	3	21	4	20	19	4	21	19
D	500,000 and over	1	24	5	25	72	5	26	73
Total		100%	99%	20	100%	100%	19	100%	100%

(a) Group
(b) Size of Population Served
(c) Percent of All 8307 US Public Libraries in 1974
(d) Percent of Total Book Collections of All US Public Libraries
(e) Number of Libraries in Final Sample
(f) Percent of All 20 Libraries in Final Sample
(g) Percent of Total Book Collections of All 20 Libraries in Final Sample
(h) Number of Libraries in Net Sample
(i) Percent of All 19 Libraries in Net Sample
(j) Percent of Total Book Collections of All 19 Libraries in Net Sample

Source for cols.(c) - (d): Marie D. Eldridge, "NCES 1974 Survey of Public Libraries," p. 252-54 of Madeline Miele, et al., eds., The Bowker Annual of Library and Book Trade Information: 1976 (Bowker, 1976).

study, and sometimes because arrangements could not be made for the needed work to be done. It took 14 tries to get the other 8 libraries in the sample of 20, with the result that the data in question from the 20th library were received too late to be analyzed with the others. Table 2 compares the distribution by population size group (a) of all 8300 public libraries in the United States in 1974, (b) the final sample of 20 libraries, and (c) the net sample of 19 libraries which submitted data analyzed in this report.

The complete list of libraries in the net sample is as follows, with the population served (7) shown in parentheses:

Group A (up to 25,000 persons served)

1. Clark County - Arkadelphia Public Library, Arkansas (24,932)
2. Brentwood Public Library, Missouri (11,248)
3. Hearst Free Library, Anaconda, Montana (15,652)
4. Albany Public Library, Oregon, (22,500)
5. Laughlin Memorial Free Library, Ambridge, Pennsylvania (16,364)
6. Brookings Public Library, South Dakota (22,158)

Group B (25,000 to 99,999 served)

7. Boynton Beach City Library, Florida (36,000)
8. Concord Public Library, New Hampshire (30,022)
9. Lexington County Circulating Library, Batesburg, South Carolina (89012)
10. Beloit Public Library, Wisconsin (48,000)

Group C (100,000 to 4999,999 persons served)

11. Peoria Public Library, Illinois (129,000)
12. Cedar Rapids Public Library, Iowa (110,642)
13. City Library, Springfield, Massachusetts (163,905)
14. Public Library of Knoxville and Knox County, Tennessee (276,293)

Group D (500,000 or more persons served)

15. Sacramento City-County Library, California (697,300)
16. Denver Public Library, Colorado (515,000)
17. Montgomery County Department of Public Libraries, Rockville, Maryland (590,000)
18. Hennepin County Library, Edina Minnesota (575,724)
19. St. Louis County Library, St. Louis, Missouri (770,000)

It is difficult to be precise as to how well this sample reflects the universe of 8300 public libraries. We had to consider the number of libraries in each size group, the percentage distribution of holdings, and such intangible factors as (1) the fact that large libraries have unusual titles and collections in depth which need to be sampled, and (2) the assumption that most small libraries in many cases hold the same titles. As it turned out (see Table 4), the percentage composition of the book stock of each size group of libraries is not basically dissimilar from that of the other size groups. Even when we weighted the means in Table 4, and the means of the 8 main subject fields in Table 5,according to the percentage of total US public library book stock held in each of the four population size groups, the results differed from those shown by less than one-half of one percent on the average.

We asked our representative in each library in Group A to provide us with specified information on each of at least 100 titles selected at random from the library's shelflist of adult books in the Dewey decimal numbers for the humanities; in Group B 200 titles; in Group C 400 titles; and in Group D 600 titles. When the cards for these titles were received they were reviewed so that mistakes or misunderstandings could be rectified by further sampling, or by exclusion of the cards in question (e.g., most public libraries classify in the 800's novels in foreign languages; since we were considering non-fiction only, we removed all cards for novels in foreign languages). Table 3 shows the projected distribution of titles in the net sample of libraries, and their actual distribution.

Randomness in the selection of titles from each library's shelflist was achieved by asking the local representative of the study to measure the number of inches of

Table 3. Distribution by Size Group of the Projected and Actual Number of Titles in the Humanities Used for Analysis

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)
	Projected		Actual	
Group	No.	%	No.	%
A	600	10	665	10
B	800	13	799	12
C	1600	27	1841	29
D	3000	50	3107	49
Total	6000	100%	6412	100%

cards (for both adult reference and circulating books) for designated subjects and numbers of the deciaml classification to no less than one-eight of an inch. Depending on the number of titles desired for each library, the local representative could then determine at what interval (in inches) he/she should select titles to be noted and reported. For example, a library in Group A was to provide data on at least 100 titles; if there were 50 inches of shelflist cards in the humanities, a card was to be drawn and copied for us every half-inch. We assumed that all titles in the shelflist are still in the collection, and that all titles in the collection are represented in the shelflist.

Once the cards had been received from a given library, reviewed for appropriateness and given a serial number, they were then checked in several book selection tools and retrospective bibliographies. All titles were checked in five tools, viz., the Public Library Catalog (H.W.Wilson Co., all editions and supplements as appropriate), Books for College Libraries (ALA, 1967 and 1975 editions as appropriate, and for books published after 1972, Choice), Book Review Digest (H.W.Wilson Co.), Booklist (ALA), and Library Journal (Bowker). Entries in Book Review Digest (BRD) and Library Journal (LJ) were actually found by using the National Library Service Cumulative Book Index for 1907-74, and the annual volumes and indexes of BRD and LJ after that.

In addition we chose ten retrospective and selective bibliographies for the various subject areas covered in the definition of the humanities. When the cards for titles from the first four libraries were so checked, a very low percentage of titles was found in all but two of these lists, mainly because these lists were about 20 years old. All further checking therefore was done only for titles in the 800's (Literature) in the Reader's Adviser (Bowker, all 12 editions as appropriate), and for titles in the 900's (History) in Leonard H. Irwin, comp., A Guide to Historical Reading: Non-Fiction (Washington, DC, Heldref Publishing Co.,

8th - 10th editions). Finally, any title not found in any of the five or six lists was checked in the National Union Catalog and in the card catalog of the University of Illinois Library, to verify the accuracy of the bibliographic information. There were only 93 titles (1% of the total) which could not be so verified, an average of 5 per library and a median of 2.

Sec. 3 The Extent of Holdings in the Humanities in the Sample Libraries

Table 4 shows the percentage composition of the book collections of the public libraries in the net sample, when grouped by population served. The percentages shown in Table 4 are based on data given us by the libraries in the sample, as for total volumes, or estimated by us from counts by the local representatives (a) of the number of shelflist drawers for juvenile, adult fiction, and adult non-fiction, and (b) of the number of inches of cards in three drawers picked at random from the adult non-fiction, and (c) of the number of cards, the number of titles, and the number of volumes (copies) in one inch of cards, picked at random in each of the three drawers (8).

Table 4. Percentage Composition of the Book Collections of the Public Libraries in the Net Sample, by Size Group

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)	(j)	(k)
	Group A		Group B		Group C		Group D		Total	Mean of
Category	Range	Mean	Range	Mean	Range	Mean	Range	Mean	SD	Groups
Percent juvenile	26.7-50.3	34.9	22.2-29.4	24.8	16.6-36.0	29.1	21.2-44.3	32.0	8.6	30.2
Percent adult fiction	16.0-31.6	24.0	22.3-43.6	30.3	9.2-25.0	17.4	8.3-18.8	14.3	8.3	21.5
Percent adult non-fiction	19.5-54.0	41.1	34.2-51.5	44.9	42.4-74.2	53.5	43.1-66.9	53.6	12.5	48.3
Percent adult humanities	4.4-11.5	9.2	6.4-17.0	10.6	7.4-12.3	10.5	8.4-20.2	12.3	3.4	10.6
Average number of volumes (in 000's)	35-53	42	43-168	101	211-651	452	995-1636	1262		
Number of copies per title for adult non-fiction	1.0-1.4	1.1	1.1-1.6	1.3	1.2-2.1	1.5	2.4-6.1	4.4		2.1

Note to col. (j): SD = Standard Deviation (of all 19 libraries)

Note to col. (k): When total means were calculated for all 19 libraries, rather than as averages of the four group means, they differed from the figures shown by no more than 0.6%.

For all 19 libraries, the mean percentage which is juvenile is seen to be 30% This agrees generally with the data found in three other sources and reported above. The spread of group means is from 25% to 35%, with the smallest libraries having the highest percentage of juvenile books. The spread of the 19 percentages is rather wide, from 17% to 50%; tne standard deviation is correspondingly large. The range of percentages for adult fiction and adult non-fiction is as wide or wider than for juvenile books, and the standard deviations as large or larger. Groups A and B each have an average of 57% of their total book stock in juvenile and adult fiction combined, while Groups C and D each have only 46% of their books in these same two categories; correspondingly Groups A and B have an average of 43% in adult non-fiction, C and D each have 54% adult non-fiction.

The estimated percentages for adult books in the humanities are much less dispersed, but the standard deviation of 3.4 means that for 95 out of 100 libraries the percentage of total book stock devoted to adult non-fiction books in the humanities will fall between 4% and 17%. In general, the larger the library, the larger the percentage of its book stock devoted to adult non-fiction (9) and to the humanities.

Later (see Sec. 7B below), we analyze US book production figures for 1972-76 for four main areas in the humanities (Law, Languages, Literature, and History). New titles and new editions together were 17.2% of all books, while all the books (i.e., copies not titles) in these same subjects held by the 19 libraries (and regardless of publication date) were 9.2% of total book stock. Apparently public libraries buy less heavily in the humanities than the proportion they are of all books published, Juvenile titles, for example, were only 7% of all US books in 1972-76, while juvenile books (copies not titles) are 30% of these libraries' total stock; adult fiction constituted 8% of all books published, and 22% of these libraries total collection.

In 1974, the 8300 public libraries in the United States held just under 388,000,000 books (10). According to the average estimated from our sample of 19 libraries, 117,176,000 of these books were juvenile, 83,420,000 adult fiction, 187,404,000 adult non-fiction, and 41,128,000 adult books in the humanities. Adult books in the humanities were 22% of all adult non-fiction and 15% of all adult books. Considering that there were about 160,000,000 persons in the US, aged 15 and above, in 1975 (11), and that these 8300 public libraries were probably serving 90% of the nation's population, there were 41 million adult books in the humanities for about 144 million adults or less than one-third of a book per capita. When we calculate the corresponding values for the four size groups of

libraries, they are 32% of a volume for each adult served in Group A, 26% in Group B, 34% in Group C, and 31% in Group D.

Sec. 4. The Composition of Library Holdings of Adult Books in the Humanities

Based on the measurements given us for each of the 19 libraries, we were able to estimate the detailed subject composition of the 10.6% of the total collections which represent the adult non-fiction books in the humanities (Table 5). We used the class numbers assigned to the appropriate subjects in the 18th edition of the Dewey decimal classification (see Appendix 1). Minor differences occurred in various libraries because of the use of earlier editions of the classification schedule or because of local variations; in all such cases it was the appropriate subjects on which we sought information and not the arbitrary class numbers of the 18th edition of Dewey. The major difficulty was in regard to archaeology which is 913.031 in the 17th (1965) and 18th (1971) editions but was 571 in the 16th (1958) edition, and since 1975 has been assigned to 930.1 (12); though we show some data in Table 5 for 913.031, we regard them as underestimates. And for that reason we treat the subject hereafter as a subdivision of History rather than as a separate and major heading.

Literature (800-899) is usually the largest main group of books in the adult humanities in these libraries (except for Group B); History (900-909, 930-999) the next largest. In general as you go from small libraries (Group A) to large ones (Group D), the percentage in Literature increases and the percentage in History declines. Between them, Literature and History account for three-quarters or more of all adult books in the humanities. None of the other six main subject areas (indentified by Roman numerals) accounted for more than 8% of all the adult books in the humanities (Fine Arts - History and Criticism); Philosophy, Law, and Languages were about equal with 4% each, and Comparative Religion and Archaeology (the latter an underestimate) with less than half of one percent each. Of all 46 subject subdivisions (identified by lower case letters) shown in Table 5, the largest were America Literature (18%), History of North America (15%), History of Modern Europe (11%), and English Literature (11%). Together these four subjects accounted for 55% of the total. No group of libraries had as much as 10% of its total in any other subject, but not all four groups had the same order for the above four subjects.

There is no tendency for the percentage distribution of adult books in the humanities to vary consistently in one direction or the other, as we go from Group A (small libraries) to Group D (large libraries). Even in the Dewey tens,

Table 5. Percentage Composition of Adult Non-Fiction Books in the Humanities by Subject for Each Size Group of Libraries in the Net Sample

(firgures in parentheses are sub-totals)

(a) Dewey Class Number(1)	(b) Group A Mean	(c) Group B Mean	(d) Group C Mean	(e) Group D Mean	(f) Total SD	(f) Total Mean	(g)
I.100-199	(4.8)	(4.2)	(4.6)	(4.2)	1.0	(4.4)	
a.100-09	0.3	0.4	0.2	0.4	0.1	0.3	
b.110-19	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.1	0.2	
c.120-29	0.5	0.6	0.3	0.4	0.2	0.4	
d.140-49	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.1	0.2	
e.160-69	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	
f.170-79	2.4	1.6	2.2	1.3	0.8	1.9	
g.180-89	0.4	0.3	0.4	0.6	0.2	0.4	
h.190-99	0.6	0.6	0.8	0.8	0.3	0.7	
II.291-291.9	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.4	
III.340-349	4.0	4.0	4.4	4.5	1.3	4.2	
IV.400-499	(3.1)	(4.8)	(4.4)	(3.9)	1.9	(4.0)	
a.400-09	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.2	
b.410-19	0.3	0.4	0.2	0.3	0.1	0.3	
c.420-29	1.1	1.6	1.6	1.3	0.5	1.4	
d.430-39	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.4	
e.440-49	0.3	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.5	
f.450-59	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.2	
g.460-69	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.3	0.4	
h.470-79	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	
i.480-89	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	
j.490-99	0.2	0.3	0.8	0.6	0.4	0.5	
V.700-799	(5.4)	(6.8)	(11.6)	(9.1)	3.0	(8.2)	
a.701.18	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.2	
b.709-.09	1.5	1.5	2.4	2.4	0.7	2.0	
c.720.9	0.2	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.2	0.3	
d.730.9-.92	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.1	0.2	0.2	
e.741.09-.92	0.3	0.1	-	-	0.2	0.1	
f.759.99	1.7	2.6	5.0	3.9	1.8	3.3	
g.769.9-.99	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.4	0.2	0.2	
h.770.9-.92	0.1	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	
i.780.9-.99	1.0	1.1	2.2	1.6	0.8	1.5	
j.792.09	0.2	0.3	0.7	0.2	0.3	0.4	
VI.880-899	(42.0)	(38.5)	(45.7)	(46.0)	5.3	(43.0)	
a.800-09	7.8	6.6	7.6	6.7	2.4	7.2	
b.810-19	21.0	13.9	17.5	20.0	5.9	18.1	
c.820-29	9.5	12.6	9.7	11.9	4.3	10.9	
d.830-39	0.6	0.9	2.2	1.3	1.0	1.2	
e.840-49	0.9	1.7	2.6	1.9	1.2	1.8	
f.850-59	0.2	0.4	0.7	0.5	0.4	0.4	
g.860-69	0.2	0.3	1.7	0.9	1.1	0.8	
h.870-79	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.5	0.2	0.4	
i.880-89	0.5	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.2	0.7	
j.890-99	0.8	1.0	2.6	1.9	1.4	1.6	
VII.900-999	(39.9)	(40.8)	(28.8)	(31.5)	7.6	(35.2)	
a.900-09	2.5	8.0	1.9	1.4	5.5	3.4	
b.930-39	1.2	1.2	0.7	1.0	0.3	1.0	
c.940-49	11.8	10.5	10.7	10.9	1.7	11.0	
d.950-59	3.1	3.0	2.7	3.3	0.9	3.0	
e.960-69	0.6	1.2	0.6	0.9	0.4	0.8	
f.970-79	19.2	15.2	11.4	13.2	4.3	14.8	
g.980-89	0.8	0.7	0.4	0.7	0.2	0.6	
h.990-99	0.7	0.8	0.2	0.4	0.4	0.4	
VIII.913.031	0.3	0.4	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.3	
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%			
No. of Books	3721	10,859	45,725	190,583	62,722		

See next page for the notes to Table 5.

Notes to Table 5:

(1) For the subject matter of each class, see Appendix 1.

Note to col. (c): After this study was done, data on the composition of book stock became available for three libraries in Group B, viz., the 20th library of the final sample and the public libraries of Champaign and Urbana, IL. They have an average of 11,402 volumes of adult books in the humanities. Their percentages by subject areas were averaged and compared with those in col. (c). Of the 46 subdivisions, 43 (94%) differed by no more than 1.0%, and 3 (6%) by 3.5 to 6%. Of the 8 main subjects, 6 differed by up to 1.7%, and 2 by 6.6 and 9.0%. All 5 of the differences from 3.5 to 9% were in Literature and History; if these three libraries (or even only the 20th library of the final sample) had been included in Group B the 7-library average for row VI would have been 42.4% and for row VII 38.0%, thus strengthening the trend for higher percentages of bookstock in Literature and lower percentages in History as one goes from Group A to Group D.

Note to col. (f): SD = Standard Deviation (of all 19 libraries).

Note to col. (g): The total means areaverages of the four group means. For the 28 subjects in the second half of the table, we calculated total means by averaging the data from the 19 libraries; in no case was the difference from that shown above more the 0.4%.

there are only five cases in which the percentages go up steadily; for all five the total difference is only 2%, and Law (340-49) is the largest with 0.5% maximum difference. There are five other cases in which the percentages go down steadily, for a combined total difference of 0.7%, and no one difference larger than 0.3%. Even when we average the percentages of Group A and B and compare the results with the average of Groups C and D, there are only four cases where the percentages increase from small to large libraries by 1% or more; they total 5.5%, and the largest is 2.3% in the case of 759-759.99 (Painting: historical and geographical treatment). To balance that, there are two cases in which the percentages go down by 1% or more, from small to large libraries; they total 8.5% and are both in the 900's, viz., 900-09 (General Works in History) with 3.6% drop and 970-79 (History of North America with 4.9% drop. In the main Dewey classes, the average percentage of books in Groups A and B is smaller than the average percentage in Groups C and D in the 700's (by 3.3%) and the 800's (5.5%). On the other hand the average percentage in Groups A and B is larger than the average in Groups C and D in the 900's (by 10.1%). The remarkable thing is how little difference there is in the percentage composition of these libraries' holdings of adult books in the humanities, when grouped by size of population served.

The percentages for the various main and subordinate subjects, for the individual libraries, vary widely within each size group, as indicated by the standard deviations for all 19 libraries. In the rest of this report, we shall not deal with any one library or with each of the 19 libraries individually, but only with the four size groups and with the total group of 19.

Sec. 5. The Sample of Titles in General

As indicated above, we received information on 100 to 600 titles from each of the 19 cooperating libraries. These titles were drawn at random from the adult humanities sections of the shelflist of each library (excluding when possible any separate collection of local history); and certain information from the shelflist record was copied onto a 4 X 6" card for each title. Upon receipt, these cards were reviewed, numbered, and given to research assistants (all library school students or graduates)for checking in each of several bibliographic tools. The appropriate data were then key-punched onto Hollerith cards (and verified), and manipulated by computer programs.

A record was kept of the time used to check in eight bibliographic tools the 701 titles reported by one of the large libraries. It took 123 hours, a gross average of 10.5 minutes per title. This does not include the time needed for rearranging the cards for these titles, as we moved to tools with different patterns of organization or indexing; nor does it include the time needed for checking in the National Union Catalog or in the University of Illinois Library card catalog those titles not found in any of the tools used. Below is shown the list of tools used, the approximate number of titles checked, and the time needed per title.

Title of Tool	No. of Titles Checked	Minutes Per Title
1. National Library Service Cumulative Book Index	701	0.9
2. Book Review Digest	701	1.4
3. Library Journal	701	0.8
4. Booklist	701	2.1
5. Public Library Catalog		
a. Latest edition and supplements	701	0.9
b. Earlier editions and supplements	475	1.6
6. Books for College Libraries		
a. 1975 edition (13)	554	0.8
b. 1967 edition (13)	141	2.0
c. Choice, for titles after 1972	164	2.9
7. Readers's Advisor		
a. 12th edition	250	1.9
b. Earlier editions	72	2.9
8. Guide to Historical Reading		
a. 10th edition	276	0.5
B. Earlier editions	166	1.1
Total/Average	5603	1.5

Each individual title other than in the 800's or 900's was checked in up to 12 different books, and each title in the 800's or 900's was checked in up to 15 books, because of the need to search up to three years of review journals and to search the earlier editions of retrospective bibliographies, depending on the publication date of a given title. It might be thought that titles would be repeated in two or more editions of the retrospective bibliographies (nos. 5-8 above) and be counted more than once for the same tool; this was avoided by relating the date of publication of each title searched with the date of publication of each edition of each book and by stopping the search whenever a given title was found listed in any edition of a given tool. Thus in the 1% verification sample (described below), 55 titles were found in one or more tools (9 in one, 11 in two, 13 in three, 11 in four, and 11 in five or more) and none had duplicate hits for different editions of these tools.

On the other hand it is true that the Book Review Digest includes reviews in the Booklist and in the Library Journal, and a title reviewed only in the latter two tools would also probably be in the former; generally however the BRD includes more than two reviews per title. By the same token, a title was marked as not found in a given tool only if it was appropriate to expect it to be there by virtue of its subject matter and its publication date. Inasmuch as there were about 80,000 searches of the 6412 titles, and for the most part the results were accepted as reported by the research assistant, the strong possibility exists of human error, In order at least to measure this error, a one percent sample of the title cards was drawn at random, after all the checking had been done, and they were rechecked in all the appropriate tools by a person who had not been involved in the original work.

Of the 65 cards drawn 47 were found to be correct in all regards. In 7 cases (11%), the verifier differed from the original checker in judging whether the review in question was favorable or neutral; these differences can be ignored because it had already been decided that the line was too fine to draw and that the two categories (neutral and favorable) should be combined. In 4 cases, the verifier was found to be in error when a third review was made of all discrepancies from the original work. In 7 cases (11%), the verifier found real errors. In 4 cases there was an increase in the number of tools in which these titles were listed; in 2 cases, there was a decrease; and in one case the review in question was definitely unfavorable but had been recorded as favorable. In presenting later the data on the quality of these books in the humanities, we use a compact grouping of (a) no listings in the tools in question, (b) listing in one or two tools, and (c) listing in three or more; none of the 7 errors found in

this verification would have moved a title from one of these three groups to another. Furthermore, in all 7 cases there was only one error per title card.

Table 6 shows that there is a reasonably close match in the distribution of the 6412 sample titles by Dewey class (or subject field) and size group of libraries, and in comparison with those libraries' estimated total holdings. For all 19 libraries together, five major subject groupings differ by 0.7% or less and the other two by 1.1% and 2.6%; of the 46 subject subdivisions (14), 44 differed by 0.7% or less and the other two by 1.3% and 1.5%. All of the four size groups are similar in this regard, with the largest difference 5.7% in 900-09 in Group B. In general the sample of 6412 titles is representative of these 19 libraries' total holdings of adult non-fiction books in the humanities.

Table 6. Percentage Distribution of the Sample of Titles by Dewey Class Number, and in Comparison with Estimated Total Holdings, for Each Size Group

(figures in parentheses are sub-totals)

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)	(j)	(k)
									Average of Groups	
Dewey Class Number	Group A Sample Titles	Group A Holdings	Group B Sample Titles	Group B Holdings	Group C Sample Titles	Group C Holdings	Group D Sample Titles	Group D Holdings	Sample Titles	Holdings
I.100-199	(5.3)	(4.8)	(4.5)	(4.2)	(5.6)	(4.6)	(5.1)	(4.2)	(5.1)	(4.4)
a.100-09	0.6	0.3	0.5	0.4	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.3
b.110-19	-	0.2	0.1	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.2
c.120-29	0.6	0.5	0.6	0.6	0.5	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.4
d.140-49	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.2
e.160-69	0.5	0.2	0.3	0.2	-	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.2
f.170-79	1.8	2.4	1.9	1.6	2.6	2.2	1.9	1.3	2.0	1.9
g.180-89	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.6	0.4	0.6	0.6	0.5	0.4
h.190-99	1.1	0.6	0.6	0.6	1.1	0.8	1.1	0.8	1.0	0.7
II.291-291.9	0.3	0.4	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.5	0.4
III.340-349	4.5	4.0	4.9	4.0	5.1	4.4	4.7	4.5	4.8	4.2
IV.400-499	(3.3)	(3.1)	(4.5)	(4.8)	(4.5)	(4.4)	(4.2)	(3.9)	(4.1)	(4.0)
a.400-09	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.2
b.410-19	0.5	0.3	0.1	0.4	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3
c.420-29	1.7	1.1	2.0	1.1	1.8	1.6	1.5	1.3	1.8	1.4
d.430-39	-	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.4
e.440-49	0.2	0.3	0.5	0.8	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.5
f.450-59	-	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2
g.460-69	0.3	0.3	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.4
h.470-79	0.3	0.2	-	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2
i.480-89	-	0.1	-	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	-	0.1
j.490-99	0.3	0.2	0.6	0.3	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.6	0.6	0.5
V.700-799	(6.9)	(5.4)	(7.8)	(6.8)	(12.3)	(11.6)	(10.1)	(9.1)	(9.3)	(8.2)
a.701.18	1.7	1.7	1.8	1.6	2.8	2.6	2.8	2.5	2.3	2.2
b.709.09 c.720.9	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.3

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)	(j)	(k)
Dewey Class Number	Group A		Group B		Group C		Group D		Average of Groups	
	Sample Titles	Holdings	Sample Titles	Holdings	Sample Titles	Holdings	Sample Titles	Holdings	Sample Titles	Holdings
d.730.9-.92	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.4	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.3	0.2
e.741.09-.92	0.3	0.3	-	0.1	-	-	0.1	-	0.1	0.1
f.759-.99	2.1	1.7	3.1	2.6	5.1	5.0	4.3	3.9	3.6	3.3
g.769.9-.99	0.2	0.2	0.4	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.2
h.770.9-.92	0.2	0.1	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2
i.780.9-.99	1.5	1.0	1.4	1.1	2.4	2.2	1.7	1.6	1.8	1.5
j.792.09	0.5	0.2	0.4	0.3	0.7	0.7	0.2	0.2	0.4	0.4
VI.800-899	(41.7)	(42.0)	(40.8)	(38.5)	(45.8)	(45.7)	(43.4)	(46.0)	(42.9)	(43.0)
a.800-09	7.8	7.8	6.4	6.6	9.1	7.6	7.2	6.7	7.6	7.2
b.810-19	19.8	21.0	15.0	13.9	17.3	17.5	17.5	20.0	17.4	18.1
c.820-29	9.6	9.5	15.1	12.6	10.0	9.7	11.5	11.9	11.6	10.9
d.830-39	0.6	0.6	1.1	0.9	1.8	2.2	1.1	1.3	1.2	1.2
e.840-49	1.1	0.9	0.6	1.7	2.2	2.6	1.8	1.9	1.4	1.8
f.850-59	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.4	0.8	0.7	0.3	0.5	0.4	0.4
g.860-69	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.3	1.2	1.7	0.8	0.9	0.6	0.8
h.870-79	0.3	0.3	0.1	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.3	0.4
i.880-89	0.8	0.5	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.9	0.8	0.8	0.7
j.890-99	1.4	0.8	1.3	1.0	2.4	2.6	1.9	1.9	1.8	1.6
VII.900-999	(38.0)	(40.2)	(36.8)	(41.2)	(26.2)	(30.0)	(32.2)	(31.7)	(32.9)	(35.5)
a.900-09	1.5	2.5	2.3	8.0	1.7	1.9	2.0	1.4	1.9	3.4
b.913.031	0.5	0.3	0.6	0.4	0.2	0.2	0.4	0.2	0.4	0.3
c.930-39	0.5	1.2	1.3	1.2	0.8	0.7	1.1	1.0	0.9	1.0
d.940-49	11.6	11.8	11.5	10.5	9.2	10.7	12.2	10.9	11.1	11.0
e.950-59	3.3	3.1	3.6	3.0	2.6	2.7	3.6	3.3	3.3	3.0
f.960-69	0.6	0.6	1.3	1.2	0.6	0.6	1.0	0.9	0.9	0.8
g.970-79	17.4	19.2	15.1	15.2	10.4	11.4	11.0	13.2	13.5	14.8
h.980-89	0.8	0.8	0.5	0.7	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.7	0.6	0.6
i.990-99	1.1	0.7	0.5	0.8	0.4	0.2	0.5	0.4	0.6	0.4
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
No. of titles	665		799		1841		3107		6412	
(% of total)	10.3%		12.4%		28.7%		48.4%		100%	
No. of books	3721		10,859		45,725		190,583		62,722	

Note to col. (j): We calculated the total averages of all 19 libraries for this column. In 26 cases (49%) there was no change from the group averages shown above; in 22 cases (42%) the difference was 0.1 to 0.3%, and in 5 cases (9%) 0.6 to 1.6%.

Sec. 6. The Quality of the Sample Titles

We come now to the crux of the question, "How good are the adult non-fiction titles in the humanities which are held by these libraries?" To answer this, we are assuming that a "good" book is one which has been recognized over the years

by reviewers, editors and the compilers of bibliographies, and that a book which is not found listed in any of several such book selection tools or retrospective bibliographies is likely not to be of much lasting value (or to be a local publication). Being listed in some tools (e.g., Booklist) is automatically a recommendation; in others, however, listing may involve a negative review or a neutral, balanced, or ambiguous opinion. Negative reviews were recorded for 179 titles, a mean of 9 and a median of 8 per library; and a range of zero (for 5 libraries) to 24 (for two). The average for the 6 libraries in Group A is one; for the 4 libraries in Group B, 7; for the 4 libraries in Group C, 18; and for the 5 libraries in Group D, 15. A fuller report on the titles with negative reviews is given later in Sec. 7D. Negative reviews or listings were not counted in the number of "hits" recorded for each title, and were not otherwise used. Neutral reviews were counted along with favorable listings as generally desirable, especially as it became difficult always to distinguish between them.

In general we sought reviews or listings of the specific book recorded as owned by a library. If the library owned a newer edition than that found listed, it was assumed that the former was as good or better than the latter. If the library owned an edition older than that listed in a bibliography, it got credit for it only if it was less than ten years older. In the case of classical works (e.g., a play by Shakespeare or essays by Emerson), a reasonably close match in the contents led to recording a hit for the title, on the ground that the content of the work was the single most important element and not the introduction, notes, appendices, illustrations, etc. of various editions.

Table 7 consists of a record of the quality of the sample of titles from the 19 libraries' holdings of adult non-fiction books in the humanities, showing for each of 53 subjects and for each size group of libraries (and totaled for all 19 libraries) (a) the number of titles examined, (b) the percentage distribution of those titles by the number of book selection tools and retrospective bibliographies in which they were found listed (not counting negative reviews), and (c) the number of such tools in which the 50th percentile falls. A tabulation of the median ratings for all subject subdivisions (those identified by letters in Table 7) for which there were 6 or more titles in any one size group of libraries, shows the following results:

Table 7. Percentage Distribution of Titles Searched by the Number of Tools in Which the Titles Were Found Listed, for Each Subject and by Size Group of Libraries

(figures in parentheses are sub-totals)

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)	(j)	(k)	(l)	(m)	(n)	(o)	(p)	(q)
		Group A (see note a)								Group B (see note a)						
Dewey Class	No. of Titles	0	1	2	3	4	5+	Median(b)	No. of Titles	0	1	2	3	4	5	Median(b)
I.100-199	(35)	(11)	(31)	(14)	(20)	(17)	(6)	2	(36)	(22)	(19)	(11)	(17)	(28)	(3)	2
a.100-09	4		25	25	25	25		2	4	50		25	25			1
b.110-19	0							-	1						100	5
c.120-29	4		25		50	25		3	5	40	20			40		1
d.140-49	2	50		50				1	1				100			3
e.160-69	3	67				33		0	2	50	50					0
f.170-79	12	8	25	25	8	25	8	2	15	20	20	13	13	33		2
g.180-89	3		100					1	3		33		33	33		3
h.190-99	7		43		43		14	3	5		20	20	20	40		3
II.291-291.9	2	50	50					0	6	17		33	33	17		2
III.340-349	30	13	17	17	20	30	3	3	39	23	20	13	20	20	3	2
VI.400-499	(22)	(32)	(23)	(23)	(18)		(4)	1	(36)	(50)	(6)	(11)	(17)	(11)	(6)	0
a.400-09	1		100					1	2				50	50		4
b.410-19	3		33		67			3	1						100	5
c.420-29	11	36	9	36	9		9	2	16	25	12	6	31	19	6	3
d.430-39	0							-	3	100						0
e.440-49	1	100						0	4	75		25				0
f.450-59	0							-	1	100						0
g.460-69	2	50			50			2	4	75		25				0
h.470-79	2		50	50				2	0							-
i.480-89	0							-	0							-
j.490-99	2	50	50					0	5	80		20				0
V.700-799	(46)	(17)	(11)	(20)	(20)	(17)	(15)	3	(62)	(24)	(8)	(10)	(24)	(21)	(13)	3
a.701.18 b.709.-09	11	27	18	18	9	18	9	2	14	14			43	43		3
c.720.9	2					50	50	4	2	50					50	2
d.730.9-.92	2			100				2	2					100		4
e.741.09-.92	2	100						0	0							-

Table 7 cont'd.

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)	(j)	(k)	(l)	(m)	(n)	(o)	(p)	(q)
		Group A								Group B						
Dewey	No. of	(See Note a)						Med-	No. of	(See note a)						Med-
Class	Titles	0	1	2	3	4	5+	ian(b)	Titles	0	1	2	3	4	5+	ian(b)
f.759-.99	14	14	7	21	43	14		3	25	40	16	12	20	4	8	1
g.769.9-.99	1		100					1	3			67		33		2
h.770.9-.92	1			100				2	2	50			50			2
i.780.9-.99	10		10	10	10	30	40	4	11	9	9	9	18	18	36	4
j.792.09	3	33			33		33	3	3				33	33	33	4
VI.800-899	(277)	(12)	(10)	(15)	(18)	(17)	(27)	3	(326)	(11)	(13)	(18)	(22)	(15)	(21)	3
a.800-09	52	23	12	17	21	12	15	2	51	20	12	20	24	10	16	2
b.810-19	132	8	11	17	14	20	29	3	120	11	15	23	17	16	18	3
c.820-29	64	8	12	12	20	17	30	3	121	8	12	13	26	16	25	3
d.830-39	4			25	50	25		3	9		22	11	22	22	22	3
e.840-49	7	14			14	14	57	5	5			40	20	20	20	3
f.850-59	1	100						0	1			100				2
g.860-69	1				100			3	2		50			50		2
h.870-79	2	50					50	3	1				100			3
i.880-89	5	20			20		60	5	6				50		50	4
j.890-99	9	11	11		33	11	33	3	10	30	10	10	10	10	30	2
VII.900-999	(253)	(14)	(12)	(17)	(16)	(24)	(18)	3	(c)(294)	(12)	(10)	(16)	(24)	(23)	(15)	3
a.900-09	10	20	10	30	10	10	20	2	18	11	11	11	33	22	11	3
b.913.031	3		33			33	33	4	5		40		20	40		3
c.930-39	9	33		33	11	22		2	10	10	20	20	10	20	20	2
d.940-49	77	12	9	16	13	29	22	4	92	3	10	15	32	25	15	3
e.950-59	22		4	27	27	36	4	3	29		3	31	21	38	7	3
f.960-69	4			50	25	25		2	10	10	20	10	40	10	10	3
g.970-79	116	16	14	12	16	22	19	3	121	21	11	15	16	19	18	3
h.980-89	5	20	20	40			20	2	4	25		25	25	25		2
i.990-99	7	14	29	14	29		14	2	4				75		25	3
Total	665	14	13	16	18	20	20	3	799	15	12	16	22	19	16	3
		Group C								Group D						
I.100-199	(c)(104)	(18)	(23)	(23)	(23)	(10)	(3)	2	(c)(160)	(29)	(25)	(20)	(14)	(8)	(4)	1
a.100-09	5	20	20	20		40		2	8	50	25		12	12		0
b.110-19	5	20	20	20	40			2	11	18	27	27	18	9		2
c.120-29	9	11	22	44	22			2	13	15	38	8	31	8		1
d.140-49	5	60			40			0	9	22	33	44				1

Table 7 cont'd.

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)	(j)	(k)	(l)	(m)	(n)	(o)	(p)	(q)
				Group C								Group D				
Dewey Class	No. of Titles	0	1	(see note a) 2	3	4	5+	Median(b)	No. of Titles	0	1	(see note a) 2	3	4	5+	Median(b)
e.160-69	0							-	5	40	20	20	20			1
f.170-79	47	11	26	26	19	13	6	2	58	36	21	17	14	7	5	1
g.180-89	11	18	9	18	46	9		3	20	35	30	15	15	5		1
h.190-99	21	29	33	14	19	5		1	34	18	21	29	9	12	12	2
II.291-291.9	8	38	12			50		2	12	33	33	17	8	8		1
III.340-349	93	33	13	22	27	3	2	2	147	26	18	18	26	10	1	2
IV.400-499	(82)	(58)	(16)	(8)	(10)	(6)	(1)	0	(129)	(57)	(15)	(7)	(9)	(10)	(2)	0
a.400-09	4	50			50			2	5	40			40	20		3
b.410-19	4		50		50			2	10	50		10	30	10		1
c.420-29	34	38	21	12	12	15	3	1	46	39	17	9	9	22	4	1
d.430-39	7	86		14				0	12	75	8	8	8			0
e.440-49	6	100						0	14	57	21	7	7	7		0
f.450-59	1	100						0	4	100						0
g.460-69	8	75	12	12				0	8	50	12	25	12			0
h.470-79	3	100						0	3	67	33					0
i.480-89	1	100						0	2	50	50					0
j.490-99	14	71	21	7				0	25	84	16					0
V.700-799	(227)	(23)	(19)	(20)	(23)	(11)	(4)	2	(311)	(27)	(19)	(24)	(17)	(9)	(3)	2
a.701.18	52	15	29	15	29	8	4	2	87	24	20	21	24	8	3	2
b.709-.09																
c.720.9	10	20	30	20	20	10		2	9	22	11	33	22		11	2
d.730.9-.92	8	38		12	38	12		2	5	20		20	60			3
e.741.09-.92	0							-	2		50	50				2
f.759-.99	94	32	19	19	21	6	4	1	134	37	19	25	10	9		1
g.769.9-.99	4	25	50		25			1	12	17	17	50	17			2
h.770.9-.92	3		33	33	33			2	4	25		25	50			2
i.780.9-.99	44	16	7	30	16	25	7	2	52	12	23	23	19	14	10	2
j.792.09	12	17	8	25	33	8	8	2	6	17	17			50	17	4
VI.800-899	(844)	(15)	(13)	(19)	(24)	(16)	(14)	3	(1347)	(13)	(15)	(19)	(22)	(14)	(17)	3
a.800-09	168	27	15	20	18	11	9	2	223	22	16	21	16	14	12	2
b.810-19	319	14	14	21	24	13	14	3	544	12	13	19	21	13	21	3
c.820-29	185	11	11	18	20	22	18	3	356	8	17	20	24	15	15	3
d.830-39	33	9	9	15	39	15	12	3	35	9	17	26	26	6	17	2
e.840-49	40	5	12	5	40	20	18	3	57	10	21	14	21	12	21	3

Table 7 cont'd

(a) Dewey Class	(b) No. of Titles	(c) Group C (see note a) 0	(d) 1	(e) 2	(f) 3	(g) 4	(h) 5+	(i) Median(b)
f.850-59	15			20	20	47	13	4
g.860-69	20	5	15	20	35	20	5	3
h.870-79	5	40				40	20	4
i.880-89	15	7	20	13	13	20	27	3
j.890-99	44	7	11	20	34	14	14	3
VII.900-999	(483)	(13)	(15)	(21)	(27)	(15)	(10)	3
a.900-09	31	16	3	26	23	16	16	3
b.913.031	3			67	33			2
c.930-39	14	7	29	21	36	7		2
d.940-49	169	8	14	20	31	18	8	3
e.950-59	48	8	8	25	31	15	12	3
f.960-69	11			9	46	27	18	3
g.970-79	192	19	19	20	22	12	8	2
h.980-89	8	12	12	12	25		38	3
i.990-99	7	14	14	14		29	29	4
Total	1841	18	15	19	24	14	10	2

(a) Dewey Class	(j) No. of Titles	(k) 0	(l) 1	(m) 2	(n) 3	(o) 4	(p) 5+	(q) Median(b)
	10		20		40	30	10	3
	24	25	29	4	21	8	12	1
	13	15	31	8	15		31	2
	27	11	15	15	22	18	18	3
	58	12	10	19	28	21	10	3
	(1001)	(17)	(13)	(22)	(24)	(16)	(10)	2
	61	20	16	36	8	12	8	2
	13	38		31	8	23		2
	33	18	9	18	21	24	9	3
	378	12	14	24	27	15	9	3
	111	14	14	18	28	22	5	3
	30	10	3	33	23	17	13	3
	342	22	12	16	22	16	12	2
	16	12	19	38	19		12	2
	17	24	6	18	29	18	6	3
	3107	19	16	20	21	14	11	2

Totals for All Nineteen Libraries

I.100-199	(c) 335	(23)	(24)	(19)	(18)	(11)	(4)	2
a.100-09	21	33	19	14	14	19		1
b.110-19	17	18	24	24	24	6	6	2
c.120-29	31	16	29	16	26	13		2
d.140-49	17	35	18	29	18			1
e.160-69	10	50	20	10	10	10		0
f.170-79	132	23	23	20	15	14	5	2
g.180-89	37	24	30	14	24	8		1
h.190-99	67	18	27	21	16	10	8	2
II.291-291.9	28	32	21	14	11	21		1
III.340-349	309	27	17	18	25	11	2	2
IV.400-499	(269)	(55)	(14)	(9)	(11)	(8)	(2)	0
a.400-09	12	33	8		42	17		3
b.410-19	18	28	17	6	39	6	6	2
c.420-29	107	36	17	12	13	17	5	1
d.430-39	22	82	4	9	4			0
e.440-49	25	72	12	8	4	4		0

d.730.9-.92	17	24		24	35	18		3
e.741.09-.92	4	50	25	25				0
f.759-.99	267	34	18	21	16	8	2	1
g.769.9-.99	20	15	25	40	15	5		2
h.770.9-.92	10	20	10	30	40			2
i.780.9-.99	117	12	14	23	17	20	14	3
j.792.09	24	17	8	12	25	21	17	3
VI.800-899	(2794)	(13)	(14)	(18)	(22)	(15)	(18)	3
a.800-09	494	23	15	20	18	13	12	2
b.810-19	1115	12	13	20	21	14	20	3
c.820-29	726	9	14	18	23	17	19	3
d.830-39	81	7	14	20	32	12	15	3
e.840-49	109	8	16	11	28	16	22	3
f.850-59	27	4	7	15	26	37	11	3
g.860-69	47	15	23	11	28	15	8	3
h.870-79	21	24	19	5	14	10	29	3
i.880-89	53	9	13	11	23	15	28	3
j.890-99	121	12	11	17	29	16	15	3

Table 7 Cont'd.

(a) Dewey Class	(b) No. of Titles	(c) (see note a) 0	(d) 1	(e) 2	(f) 3	(g) 4	(h) 5+	(i) Median(b)
		Total for All Nineteen Libraries						
f.450-59	6	100						0
g.460-69	22	64	9	18	9			0
h.470-79	8	62	25	12				0
i.480-89	3	67	33					0
j.490-99	46	78	17	4				0
V.700-799	(646)	(25)	(18)	(21)	(20)	(12)	(5)	2
a.701.18 b.709.09	164	21	21	17	26	12	4	2
c.720.9	23	22	17	22	17	9	13	2

(a) Dewey Class	(j) No. of Titles	(k) 0	(l) 1	(m) 2	(n) 3	(o) 4	(p) 5+	(q) Median(b)
VII.900-999	(2031)	(15)	(13)	(20)	(23)	(18)	(11)	3
a.900-09	120	18	12	29	16	14	12	2
b.913.031	24	21	12	25	12	25	4	2
c.930-39	66	17	14	21	21	20	8	2
d.940-49	716	10	13	21	27	19	11	3
e.950-59	210	9	10	22	28	24	7	3
f.960-69	55	7	6	26	31	18	13	3
g.970-79	771	20	14	16	20	16	13	2
h.980-89	33	15	15	30	18	3	18	2
i.990-99	35	17	11	14	29	14	14	3
Total	6412	18	15	19	22	15	12	2

(a) Percentage Distribution of Titles by the Number of Tools in Which They Were Found Listed

(b) This is the number of tools in which the 50th percentage falls.

(c) The group totals and subtotals include four cases which had been incorrectly allowed into the sample of titles analyzed, and these are not found in any subject sub-division, viz., 3 cases in the 130's (1 in Group C and 2 in Group D), and one in the 920's (in Group B).

Median No. of Tools	Size Group of Libraries A	B	C	D	Total
5	1	0	0	0	1
4	2	2	2	1	7
3	7	10	13	11	41
2	9	4	10	13	36
1	0	1	3	8	12
0	0	0	4	5	9
Total	19	17	32	38	106

The one subject with a median rating of 5 is in 840-49 (French Literature) and is in Group A. Three of the 7 subjects with medians of four are in the Fine Arts (two in Music, in Group A and B; one in Theater, in Group D); two in Literature (Greek Literature, in Group B; and Italian Literature, in Group C); and two are in History (Modern Europe, in Group A; and History of Other Parts of the World, in Group C). Of the subjects with medians of three, most (88%) are almost equally in Literature and in History (American and English Literature, and History of Asia, in all 4 groups); Literature accounts for 3 and History for 2 of the 7 subjects in Group A, for 3 and 5 of the 10 subjects in Group B, for 7 and 5 of the 13 subjects in Group C, and for 6 and 5 of the 11 subjects in Group D. Literature and History subdivisions account for 84% of all 49 subject subdivisions with medians of three or better; subdivisions of the Fine Arts for 10%, of Philosophy 4%, and English language for 2%.

Of the 9 subject subdivisions with medians of zero, all but one are in Languages (two each in German, French, Spanish and Portuguese, and other languages). The only other subject subdivision with at least six titles and a median of zero tools in which they were listed was General Works in Philosophy, in Group D.

At first sight, there appears to be a relationship between the quality level of the 48 subjects (as indicated by the median number of tools in which titles were reviewed or listed, for subjects II and III and the 46 subject subdivisions identified by letters in the final section, "Totals for All Nineteen Libraries," of Table 7), and the percentage of the number of titles analyzed (col. (j) of Table 6). Nine subjects with a quality rating of zero have an average of 0.3% of all titles; 6 subjects with a quality rating of one have an average of 1.2%; 16 with a rating of two have 2.3%; and 17 with a rating of three have 3.2%. Since 78% of all titles are in Literature and History, we reanalyzed these figures in two parts. Six subject subdivisions of Literature and History with a quality rating of two have an average of 4.2% of all titles analyzed, and 13 subdivisions of Literature and History with a rating of three have an average of 4.0%. Of the other 29 subjects (in Philosophy, Comparative Religion, Law, Languages, and Fine Arts), 9 have a

rating of zero with an average of 0.3% of all titles, 6 have a rating of one with an average of 1.2%, 10 have a rating of two with an average of 1.2%, and 4 have a rating of three with an average of 0.7%. In the light of this further analysis, the relationship between quality level and number of titles is not consistently positive.

Of the seven main subject groups in Table 7 (i.e., those identified by Roman numerals), Literature and History each have three bibliographic tool listings per median item; Philosophy, Law, and Fine Arts each have two listings per median item; Comparative Religion's median is in one tool; and the median for Languages is in zero tools. In general the four size groups of libraries agree with this overall ranking.

We can further summarize Table 7 by using only three categories of ratings for the books in question, viz., (a) those found listed in none of the tools in question, (b) those found in one or two tools, and (c) those found in three or more tools. The results are shown in Table 8 for the major subject groupings only (those identified by Roman numerals in Table 7). The data in Table 8 suggest two main thoughts. One is that these libraries taken together have a sample of adult non-fiction titles in the humanities which overall rate rather well. About half are found listed in three or more book selection tools or retrospective bibliographies, compared with an average of 32% in three earlier studies using this inductive technique (15). In the present study, the percentage of titles found in no tools (16%) is measurably less than the average of the earlier studies (23%).

The second main observation is how well the smaller libraries (Groups A and B) did overall, and how much better they score than do the larger libraries (Groups C and D). To be sure, the smaller ones have fewer titles and presumably therefore should have a higher percentage of well-recommended books. But in the subjects with the largest number of titles (Literature and History), the larger libraries do better than in those with much smaller numbers of titles (e.g., Philosophy, Law, and Fine Arts). Furthermore, most of the book selection tools and retrospective bibliographies have more titles in each of these subject areas than are represented by the number here for even the larger libraries in this study (discussed below in Sec. 7E). The present data would appear not to support the verdict by Robert Leigh in the Public Library Inquiry almost 30 years ago, based on a sample of 58 libraries, that " the smaller public libraries select their current books on the basis of their sales volume even more than upon the recommendations made by leaders of their own profession and much more than upon the recommendations of professional critics" (16).

It might be suggested that small and medium-sized libraries use Booklist and Library Journal as buying guides, but if so those libraries in our sample were

Table 8. Summary Percentage Distribution of the Number of Tools in Which the Sample Titles Were Found Listed, by Major Subjects and for Each Size Group

(figures in parentheses are number of titles)

(a) Subject and No. of Tools	(b) Size Group of Libraries A	(c) B	(d) C	(e) D	(f) Total Mean(1)	(g) Average of Groups(2)
I. 100-199 (Philosophy)						
0:	11	22	18	29	23	20
1-2:	45	30	46	45	43	42
3+:	43	48	36	26	33	38
Total:	100% (35)	100% (36)	100% (104)	100% (160)	100% (335)	100%
II. 291-291.9 (Comparative Religion)						
0:	50	17	38	33	32	34
1-2:	50	33	12	50	35	36
3+:	0	50	50	16	32	29
Total:	100% (2)	100% (6)	100% (8)	100% (12)	100% (28)	100%
III. 340-349 (Law)						
0:	13	23	33	26	27	24
1-2:	34	33	35	36	35	34
3+:	53	43	32	37	38	41
Total:	100% (30)	100% (39)	100% (93)	100% (147)	100% (309)	100%
IV. 400-499 (Languages)						
0:	32	50	58	57	55	49
1-2:	46	17	24	22	23	27
3+:	22	34	17	21	21	24
Total:	100% (22)	100% (36)	100% (82)	100% (129)	100% (269)	100%
V. 700-799 (Fine Arts)						
0:	17	24	23	27	25	23
1-2:	31	18	39	43	39	33
3+:	52	58	38	29	37	44
Total:	100% (46)	100% (62)	100% (227)	100% (311)	100% (646)	100%
VI. 800-899 (Literature)						
0:	12	11	15	13	13	13
1-2:	25	31	32	34	32	30
3+:	62	58	54	53	55	57
Total:	100% (277)	100% (326)	100% (844)	100% (1347)	100% (2794)	100%

(a) Subject and No. of Tools	(b) Size Group of Libraries A	(c) B	(d) C	(e) D	(f) Total Mean(1)	(g) Average of Group(2)
VII. 900-999 (History)						
0:	14	12	13	17	15	14
1-2:	29	26	36	35	33	31
3+:	58	62	52	50	52	55
Total:	100% (253)	100% (294)	100% (483)	100% (1001)	100% (2031)	100%
Total for All Fields						
0:	14	15	18	19	18	16
1-2:	29	28	34	35	33	32
3+:	57	57	47	46	49	52
Total:	100% (665)	100% (799)	100% (1841)	100% (3107)	100% (6412)	100%

(1) The sum of cases for all 19 libraries as a percentage of all cases.

(2) Calculated as the average of the four groups.

astute enough to pick titles which were also recommended frequently by other sources and did so proportionately more often than did the large libraries. Furthermore the smaller libraries did not restrict themselves to Booklist and Library Journal, as witness the 14-15% of all their titles in the humanities which were not listed in either of those or any of several tools.

Another possibility is that the inductive method of evaluation is not as useful or as successful in regard to large libraries as medium and small ones, possibly because large libraries get more and therefore sometimes more borderline titles in any given subject area. No one can be certain whether this is true or not, but a comparison of the results of three earlier studies (typically in small and medium-sized libraries) with those found here ("Total" row of Table 7) shows that the former give higher percentages for no, one and two lists and lower percentages for three, four, and five lists than for all four size groups of libraries in the present study (17).

Since the three earlier studies were in the fields of fiction, public health, and reference books generally, one might hypothesize that the generally better showing of libraries in this study may be related to the fact that librarians have had undergraduate subject majors more often in English and in History than in any other subjects. Still another conjecture is that libraries in towns of less than 10,000 population each are distinctly different from those in larger communities, even in the next range of 10,000 to 25,000 population. It happened that all six

libraries in Group A serve from 10,000 to 25,000 people, but libraries serving less than 10,000 are 79% of all those encompassed in Group A and 65% of all US public libraries (18). These conjectures are all possible, but we have no data by which to confirm or deny them.

Sec. 7. Further Analyses of the Sample of Titles

A. Titles Found in None of the Tools

It is naturally of interest to ascertain something of the nature of the titles which were found in none of the book selection tools or retrospective bibliographies. There were 1138 such titles (not including four titles which were included in the sample by error). They are distributed among the four groups of libraries in the following proportions: Group A 7.1%, Group B 10.7%, Group C 29.8%, and Group D 51.5%. From the "% of total" row of Table 6, the distribution of all 6412 titles is as follows: Group A 10.3%, Group B 12.4%, Group C 28.7%, and Group D 48.4%. Application of the chi-square test (3 df, $X^2 = 1.27$, $p > .10$) shows that the differences between these two distributions are well within the limits of what can occur by sampling error.

All but 5% of these 1138 titles were verified in either the National Union Catalog or the University of Illinois Library card catalog (ranging from 88% in Group B to 97% in Group A). They were searched in a median average of six tools (true for all four groups of libraries), and 96% were checked in either five or six tools. Table 9 compares the percentage distribution by main Dewey decimal class of the 1138 titles and of all 6412 (from Table 6), for each group of libraries separately and for all four groups combined.

The differences between columns (j) and (k) of Table 9 can be explained by sampling error (13 df, $X^2 = 7.51$, $p > .10$). The main differences are (1) the higher percentages of titles found in no tools in Dewey classes 400-499 and (to a lesser extent) 700-799 than in all titles analyzed, and (2) the lower percentage of titles found in no tools in Dewey classes 800-899 and (to a lesser extent) 900-999. This pattern is generally true of all four groups of libraries. As might be expected, books of literature and history tend to be reviewed, while dictionaries and grammars do not. Judging only from the information supplied form the shelflist record for these titles, 297 or 26% of the 1138 could be assigned to categories not usually reviewed, viz., 135 textbooks, 42 local publications, 32 dictionaries, 28 foreign publications, 19 GPO documents, 11 books in foreign languages, 10 art exhibition catalogs, 8 pamphlets, 6 paperbacks, and 6 test preparation titles.

Table 9. Percentage Distribution by Main Dewey Decimal Classes of Titles Found in No Tools and of All Titles Analyzed

(a) Dewey Decimal Class	(b) Group A #	(c) Group A ##	(d) Group B #	(e) Group B ##	(f) Group C #	(g) Group C ##	(h) Group D #	(i) Group D ##	(j) Average of the Groups #	(k) Average of the Groups ##
100-199	4.4	5.3	6.6	4.5	5.6	5.6	7.8	5.1	6.1	5.1
291-291.9	1.1	0.3	0.8	0.8	0.9	0.4	0.7	0.4	0.9	0.5
340-349	4.4	4.5	7.3	4.9	9.7	5.1	6.6	4.7	7.0	4.8
400-499	7.7	3.3	14.8	4.5	14.2	4.5	12.6	4.2	12.3	4.1
700-799	7.7	6.9	13.1	7.8	14.7	12.3	14.2	10.1	12.4	9.3
800-899	36.3	41.7	30.3	40.8	36.3	45.8	29.7	43.4	33.2	42.9
900-999	38.5	38.0	27.0	36.8	18.6	26.2	28.3	32.2	28.1	32.9
Total	100.1%	100.0%	99.9%	100.1%	100.0%	99.9%	99.9%	100.1%	100.0%	99.6%
Number	91	665	122	799	339	1841	586	3107	1138	6412

\# Percentage Distribution of Titles Found in No Tools
\#\# Percentage Distribution of All Titles Analyzed

When the 1138 titles found in no tools were arranged by date of publication, the percentage which were published in the years 1956-76 are 72% for Group A, 79% for Group B, 62% for Group C, 68% for Group D, and 66% for the total mean (and 70% for the average of the group means). As will be brought out later (in Table 10), the comparable percentages for all 6412 titles analyzed (for 1957-76, or one year less) are 65%, 72%, 73%, 71%, and 71% (and 70%). Even when we deduct the titles found in no tools from all the titles analyzed and calculate the percentage of those titles found in one or more tools which were published in 1957-76 (64%, 71%, 75%, 72%, 72%, and 71%), the differences between these figures and those given above for titles found in no tools are not significant (7 df, X^2=2.08, p=.95). It appears that the smaller libraries bought proportionately more books in recent years which are found in no book selection or reviewing tools, and the larger libraries proportionately fewer. Because of the larger number of titles in Groups C and D, the total average percentage of all titles found on no lists and published in the last 20 years is measurably less than the percentage of titles found on one or more lists. That is to say, as a group, books found on no list are alittle older than those so found.

B. By Date of Publication

Table 10 shows the distribution by three large time periods of the dates of publication of the sample titles analyzed in this study, for each size group of libraries, and for each main subject area and for all seven subject areas combined. Almost three-fourths of these books were published in the last 20 years, and almost 90% in the last 40 years. Of the seven subject areas shown, Law (340-349) has an even higher percentage of books in the last 20 years, while Literature (800-899) and Languages (400-499) have the lowest percentages of recent

Table 10. Percentage Distribution by Time Periods of the Sample Titles Analyzed in This Study, For Each Main Subject and by Size Group of Libraries

(a) Subject and Time Period	(b) Size Groups of Libraries A	(c) B	(d) C	(e) D	(f) Total Mean (1)		(g) Average of Groups (2)
I. 100-199 (Philosophy)							
1957-76	63	72	76	68	70		70
1937-56	23	25	16	19	19		21
To 1936	11	3	8	13	11		9
No date	3	-	-	-	#		1
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%		100%
No.	(35)	(36)	(104)	(160)		(335)	
II. 291-291.9 (Comparative Religion)							
1957-76	100	83	88	58	75		82
1937-56	-	-	12	17	11		7
To 1936	-	-	-	25	11		6
No date	-	17	-	-	4		4
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%		100%
No.	(2)	(6)	(8)	(12)		(28)	
III. 340-349 (Law)							
1957-76	83	95	83	89	87		88
1937-56	17	5	11	7	9		10
To 1936	-	-	6	4	4		2
No date	-	-	-	-	-		-
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%		100%
No,	(30)	(39)	(93)	(147)		(309)	
IV. 400-499 (Languages)							
1957-76	73	64	68	64	66		67
1937-56	14	22	17	19	18		18
To 1936	13	11	13	17	15		14
No date	-	3	1	-	1		1
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%		100%
No.	(22)	(36)	(82)	(129)		(269)	
V. 700-799 (Fine Arts)							
1957-76	61	86	82	78	79		77
1937-56	30	10	8	15	13		16
To 1936	8	2	9	7	8		6
No date	-	3	1	#	1		1
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%		100%
No.	(46)	(62)	(227)	(311)		(646)	
VI. 800-899 (Literature)							
1957-76	57	65	68	66	66		64
1937-56	24	20	16	17	18		19
To 1936	18	14	15	15	15		16
No date	1	1	#	1	1		1
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%		100%
No.	(277)	(326)	(844)	(1347)		(2794)	
VII. 900-999 (History)							
1957-76	71	76	76	75	75		74
1937-56	20	17	12	16	15		16
To 1936	8	7	12	9	9		9
No date	1	#	#	#	#		#
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%		100%
No.	(253)	(294)	(483)	(1001)		(2031)	
Total for All Subjects							
1957-76	65	72	73	71	71		70
1937-56	22	18	14	16	16		18
To 1936	12	9	12	12	12		11
No date	1	1	#	#	1		1
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%		100%
No.	(665)	(799)	(1841)	(3107)		(6412)	

#0.5% or less.

(1) The sum of cases for all 19 libraries as a percentage of all cases.

(2) Calculated as the average of the four groups.

books and highest percentages of books more than 40 years old.

Of the four size groups of libraries, Group A (the samllest libraries) has distinctly lower percentages of recent books in general, and specifically in Philosopy (100-199), Fine Arts (700-799) and Literature (800-899), and is higher than the other groups only in Languages (400-499). Group B excels in Law (340-349) and Fine Arts (700-799), and Group C in Philosophy (100-199) and Literature (800-899).

This emphasis on recency is a well-known aspect of public library book collections. In two earlies studies using this inductive method of book collection evaluation, one of adult fiction and one of adult reference books, the percentages of all titles analyzed which were published in the previous 30 years (1936-65) were 86% and 88% (19). The comparable figure for the four groups of 19 libraries in the present study for all subject areas in the humanitites for the last 30 years (1947-76) is 81%. A study of ten small Pennsylvania public libraries in 1967 reported an average of 36% of adult books in Literature (800-899) had been published in the previous 26 years (1941-66) (20), as compared with 67% in this study for Group A for 25 years (1952-76) in the same subject area.

American book production figures are published annually for each of over 20 subject categories; we have used the figures for the latest 5-year period for which we have comparable data in this study, with the results shown in Table 11. The four subject areas shown represent 86% of all the adult non-fiction books of the 19 libraries in this study in the humanities (see col. g of Table 5 above); they are almost identical in definition by Dewey decimal classes with the figures for US book production viz., the exclusion of travel and biography from History, except that archaeology (913.031) is kept in our data but not in the book production figures. The two sets of figures for books in Languages are very close; the difference in the case of Law is understandable, since most law books are for lawyers. In Literature these libraries have a considerably smaller percentage of titles than in the case of all book producation, while in History these libraries have a much larger percentage thanhistory books are of all titles published; this is especially true of Groups A and B and less so of Group D, while Group C is closest of all to the book production percentages. In this 5-year period, these four subject areas together declined slightly as a percentage of total book production, from 18% in 1972 to 16% in 1976; Literature fell from 10% of total to 7%, History increased from 4% to 6%, and Law and Languages stayed stable at 2% and 1% respectively. The number of titles in the humanities published in the US in 1972-76 was 17.2% of the total number of all 171,642 books produced.

Table 11. Distribution of Titles Analyzed in This Study and Published in 1972-76 by Subject and for Each Size Group of Libraries, in Comparison with Total US Book Production in These Subjects in These Years

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)	(j)	(k)	(l)	(m)	(n)
	Titles Held by Libraries in Group								Total Mean		Average of Groups	US Book Production	
	A		B		C		D						
Subject	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	%	No.	%
Law (340-349)	9	9	15	9	22	9	47	9	93	9	9	3678	12
Languages (400-499)	5	5	10	6	14	6	18	4	47	5	5	1860	6
Literature (800-899)	37	37	62	37	135	55	227	46	461	46	44	16399	56
History (900-999)	49	49	79	48	72	30	207	41	407	40	42	7543	26
Total	100	100%	166	100%	243	100%	499	100%	1008	100%	100%	29480	100%

Source for cols. (m)-(n): The data on American book production appear first in Publishers Weekly, and later in the Bowker Annual of Library and Book Trade Information. We have used the latter source for 1973 to 1977 for the figures for the years 1972-76. Each year's edition gives data for the two previous years, and sometimes the two sets of data for the overlap year are not the same; in such cases we used the later figures. Apparently until 1975 these annual production figures included paperback books; for 1975 and 1976, they include only hardcover books.

It would be of interest to ascertain whether there is any relationship between the publication dates of the 6412 titles analyzed in this study, and the numbers of book selection tools and retrospective bibliographies in which they were found listed. Unfortunately this was not included in the computer analysis of the data, except that we know (see p. 26 above) that the titles found in no tools were more concentrated in the last 20 years in Groups A and B than were titles so found, and in Groups C and D they were less concentrated in the last 20 years than were the titles found listed. The total mean for the 19 libraries was less for the titles found in no tools than for those found in one or more tools. In two earlier studies using this same method of collection evaluation, fiction titles not found listed were more recent than those listed, while reference titles not found were older than those listed (21).

C. By Number of Duplicate Copies

Included in the information we requested from our local representatives in the 19 cooperating libraries was the number of copies now held by each library of each title selected at random for analysis. In all there were 18,927 additional copies of the 6412 titles, or a gross total average of 4 copies for each title. As might be imagined, this varies considerably by size of library. Table 12 shows that li-

Table 12. Distribution by Size Group of Libraries of the Number of Titles Analyzed and of Their Additional Copies

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)
	Size Group of Libraries					Average
Category	A	B	C	D	Total	of Groups
No. of titles	665	799	1841	3,107	6,412	
No. of added copies	55	257	954	17,661	18,927	
Total	720	1056	2795	20,768	25,339	
No. of copies per title	1.1	1.3	1.5	6.7	4.0	2.6
No. of copies per title of all adult non-fiction (from Table 4)	1.1	1.3	1.5	4.4		2.1

Note: We also calculated the number of copies per title (line 4 of Table 12) for each library separately; when we averaged these for each group, in two cases the match was exact, in two cases the difference was 0.1 each.

braries in Groups A-C had an average of 1.1 to 1.5 copies per title, while in Group D it was 6.7; this difference is significant at the 5% level (3 df, X^2=8.45, .05> p>.02). We are encouraged to have some confidence in these figures because of the close match in three of the four size groups with the separately calculated estimates of copies per title in all of the adult non-fiction of these libraries.

It would be worth knowing whether titles listed in increasingly more book selection tools and retrospective bibliographies are characterized by having more added copies. Unfortunately this analysis was not included in the computer program, but we did examine the titles found in no tools from this point of view. The average number of copies of the titles found in no book selection tools is 1.1 in Group A, 1.1 in Group B, 1.3 in Group C, 6.6 in Group D, 4.0 for the total average, and 2.5 for the average of the group means. By subtraction from the data in Table 12, we estimate that the average number of copies of titles found in one or more book selection tools and retrospective bibliographies is 1.1 in Group A, 1.4 in Group B, 1.6 in Group C, 6.7 in Group D, 3.9 for the total average, and 2.7 for the average of the four groups. The differences between the two sets of values for the four groups is not significant (3 df, X^2=0,06, p>,95).

The tendency for libraries to buy more copies of titles found in book selection tools (than of titles found in no or only a few tools) was confirmed in an earlier study of the inductive method of book collection evaluation, in the area of public health; titles found in no tools were represented by 2.8 copies each, those found in one or two tools by 3.5, and those in three or more tools by 4.3 (22).

We used the 1% verification sample of 65 titles (see p. 12 above) to estimate the distribution of added copies by major subjects. For Philosophy, Law, Languages

and Fine Arts combined, there were 17 titles with an average of 1.6 copies per title; for Literature, 31 titles with 3.9 copies per title; and for History, 17 titles with 4.2 copies per title. For all 65 titles, the total average was 3.4 copies per title.

D. Of the Titles with Negative Reviews

As reported earlier, there were 179 titles (3% of the total) which were found to have one or more negative reviews or "not recommended" listings. By main subject area they are distributed as follows: 5% in Philosophy, 4% in Law, 5% in Languages, 8% in Fine Arts, 43% in Literature, and 34% in History. This corresponds to the total distribution of all 6412 titles (see Table 6 above). By size group of libraries, 10.4% are Group A, 12.5% in Group B, 28.7% in Group C, and 50.2% in Group D; this distribution too is very close to that of all 6412 titles (see Table 6 above). By date of publication, 88% appeared in the last 20 years (1957-76), 10% in the next previous 20 years (1937-56), and 2% in the years before 1937; clearly these titles are in general of more recent date than are the total 6412 (see Table 10). These 179 titles with negative reviews represent an average of 2.1 copies, while the total average for all 19 libraries is 4.0 and the average of the group means is 2.6 (see Table 12).

We can separate 145 titles with only one negative review, from the remaining 34 with two or three negative reviews apiece. The latter are more heavily concentrated in Literature and History (85% vs. 76% for the former) and were almost all (97%) published in the last 20 years. The titles with only one negative review were represented by 3.2 copies each; those with two or more negative reviews by 2.6 copies each. The latter were distributed by size groups as follows: 6% in Group A, 26% in Group B, 32% in Group C, and 35% in Group D. Group B had twice as large a percentage as it had of all titles analyzed; Group D had distinctly less than of all titles.

The 216 negative reviews in question were found in three book selection tools, viz., 48% in Library Journal, 36% in Book Review Digest, and 17% in Choice. For 30 (17%) of these 179 titles, this was the only review or listing found. For the other 149 titles, a total of 287 other reviews or listings were found, in 12 different tools, an average of 1.9 per title. These 30 titles for which only one review was found, and that an unfavorable one, have a mean average of 5.6 copies each, and a median and mode of 1. The general conclusion seems to be that one negative review does not eliminate a title from being purchased by public libraries.

E. Of the Use of the Different Tools

It is a matter of methodological interest to look at the relative performance of the various book selection tools and retrospective bibliographies which were

used in this study. Though several earlier editions of some of the tools were used, as well as many volumes of those which are serials, we can group all of them into 12 categories, as follows:

1. Book Review Digest (BRD). Bowker, 1905 to date.
2. Library Journal (LJ). Bowker, 1907 to date.
3. Booklist (Bk). ALA, 1905 to date.
4. Public Library Catalog, 6th edition (PLC6). Wilson, 1973 and supplements.
5. Public Library Catalog, 5th and earlier editions (PLC5). Wilson, 1968 to 1934.
6. Books for College Libraries, 2d edition (BCL2). ALA, 1975. Includes no books published later than 1972.
7. Books for College Libraries, 1st edition (BCL1). ALA, 1967. Includes no books published later than 1963.
8. Choice (Ch). ALA, 1973 to date. Used only for titles published since 1972.
9. The Reader's Adviser, 12th edition (RA12). Bowker, 1974-77.
10. The Reader's Adviser, 11th and earlier editions (RA11). Bowker, 1968-1921.
11. A Guide to Historical Reading: Non-Fiction, 10th edition (GHR10). Heldref Publishing Co., 1976.
12. A Guide to Historical Reading: Non-Fiction, 9th and 8th editions (GHR9). McKinley Publishing Co., 1970 and 1964.

Table 13 shows the relative use made of each of the 12 categories of tools, in general and for each size group of libraries. It will be seen that the three general book selection periodicals each accounts for about 20% of all the listings and reviews found for the 6412 titles. In second place, with 5% to 8% of all listings are PLC6, PLC5, BCL2, and RA12. Finally, with 1% to 3% each are the five remaining tools. It is noteworthy that the percentages of listings for Group A titles which were found in Bk and LJ are just about the same as those for Group D. This argues against the contention that small libraries used only BK and LJ as buying guides, and more so than did large libraries; if they had done so, one might logically expect that Group A's percentages for these journals would be relatively high and Group D's relatively low. Tables similar to Table 13 were prepared for each of the main subject areas, but revealed no great differences. LJ increase its percentages of total citations (to a high of 28%) in Philosophy, Law, and Fine Arts. The Bk is highest in History but with only 21%. RA12 and RA11 account for 19% of all the listings in Literature, and GHR10 and GHR9 for 8% of those in History.

A final consideration concerns the total number of titles which were listed or reviewed in these various tools. In part this may enable us to judge whether the large libraries (in Group D) had in effect exhausted the supply of "good" books and had perforce to buy borderline and less desirable titles. In part also this analysis seeks to ascertain whether this use of the inductive method of book collection evaluation had in this particular instance come up against the limit of

Table 13. Percentage Distribution by Book Selection Tool of All Listings Found for the 6412 Titles, for Each Size Group of Libraries

(a) Book Selection Tool	(b) Size Groups of Libraries A	(c) B	(d) C	(e) D	(f) Total Average	(g) Average of Groups
1. BRD	21	21	24	23	22	22
2. LJ	19	20	22	21	21	20
3. Bk	21	21	17	18	18	19
4. PLC6	10	9	6	6	7	8
5. PLC5	6	4	5	5	5	5
6. BCL2	8	7	8	10	8	8
7. BCL1	3	3	4	3	3	3
8. Ch	2	3	3	3	3	3
9. RA12	5	6	7	7	7	6
10. RA11	2	2	3	3	3	2
11. GHR10	2	2	1	1	2	2
12. GHR9	1	1	1	1	1	1
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
No. of titles	(1877)	(2130)	(4177)	(7118)	(15,302)	

the titles in those tools for which a judgment of quality was available or could be inferred. Table 14 gives the results of the estimates made for this purpose, and projected to only ten years or two editions of each tool. Insofar as possible, each subject area corresponds in general to the way it has been defined in this study, e.g. psychology is omitted from Philosophy, fiction from Literature, and travel and biography from History. It is recognized that each of the two editions of PLC, BCL, RA and GHR list some titles in common.

Of the estimated total number of reviews and listings of adult non-fiction books in the humanites, shown in Table 14, we have to make a deduction for duplicate reviews and listings of the same titles in the different tools. Our 6412 titles were found 15,302 times in these tools (see Table 13 above), an average of 2.39. We therefore divide the grand total of Table 14 by 2.39, and get an estimated net total of 55,143 different titles. Estimating in round figures that all of these sources together list or review over 5000 different titles in the humanities in an average year, and over 55,000 in ten years, it would appear that the answers to the two questions posed above are in the negative. That is to say, most of these 55,000 titles ought to be considered for purchase by the large public libraries, and this estimated total number of reviews and listings allows room for the evaluation of the book collection of even large public libraries.

Table 14. Estimated Total Number of Adult Titles Reviewed or Listed in Each Tool for up to Ten Years, by Main Subject Areas of the Humanities

(a) Subject Area	(b) LJ	(c) Bk	(d) PLC	(e) BCL	(f) RA	(g) GHR	(h) Total
Philosophy	1,010	110	299	2,939			4,358
Comparative Religion	60		65	139			264
Law	3,070(a)	160	200	1,256			4,686
Languages	230	60	331	1,461			2,082
Fine Arts	2,690	740	749	4,680			8,859
Literature	5,540	2,690	2,860	20,350	13,325		44,765
History	4,880	1,880	1,528	17,503		3,700	29,491
Archaeology	290	10	40	146			486
Total	17,770	5,650	6,072	48,474	13,325	3,700	94,991
BRD							16,670
Choice							20,130
Grand Total							131,791

(a) Includes criminology

Sources of Estimates: Appropriate subject areas in LJ annual cumulations of reviews for 1974-76 were counted (number of reviews on a sample page times number of pages), averaged, and multiplied by ten; individual issues of Bk were scanned for 1974/75 and 1975/76 using suggested Dewey decimal classification numbers, totaled for the year, averaged, and multiplied by ten; in PLC and BCL, counts for appropriate subject areas were made (number of titles on a sample page times number of pages and added together for the two most recent editions; for RA11 (vol. 1), RA12 (vols. 1-2), GHR9, and GHR10, estimates were made of the number of entries in the title indexes and added together for the two most recent editions.

Sources of Special Estimates by Subject: For Comparative Religion in LJ, we averaged the percentages of such titles in the general field of religion in Bk, PLC6, PLC5, BCL2, and BCL 1, and applied the result (5%) to the estimated total number of reviews of books on religion. Similarly for Fine Arts in LJ, titles on history and criticism were 48% of all titles in 700-799 in the five tools. For Literature in BCL, we subtracted 25% of the entries in this subject for fiction; in RA11 and 12, we used only half of the estimated total number of entries because fiction was included, and fiction was 44% of the combined figures for fiction and literature in US book production for 1972-76 (see source note to Table 11 above). BCL is much more selective than RA with regard to fiction entries.

BRD had an estimated average of 5283 reviews of adult books (based on sample counts, and projections to the whole volumes for 1973-75, and averaged). All titles in the humanities were 29% of total adult books reviewed in LJ, 24% of Bk, 19% of those listed in PLC5 and PLC6, and 52% of those in BCL1 and BCL2. This averages out to 31%, which was applied to the BRD total, and to the average of 6405 reviews in Ch for 1974-76 (see "Book Review Media," p. 191 in Bowker Annual: 1976 and p. 328 in Bowker Annual: 1977).

F. Comparative Data by Subject

In a previous study of adult fiction and reference books in 12 public libraries, it was found that those libraries which were strong in one type of book tended to be weak in the other (23). In the present study we used the four groups of libraries

and calculated the Spearman rho coefficient of rank correlation between each of the six main Dewey decimal classes (omitting the 291 class because of the small numbers involved), in regard to the percentage of titles (a) found on no list, and (b) found on three or more lists. The results are shown in Table 15.

Table 15. Spearman Coefficients of Rank Correlation for the Four Size Groups of Libraries Between the Dewey Classes Shown in Regard to the Percentage of Titles (A) Found on No List, and (B) Found on Three or More Lists

(a) Dewey Class	(b) 100	(c) 340	(d) 400	(e) 700	(f) 800	(g) 900	
100		.4	.4	1.0	0	.2	A
340	.6		1.0	.4	.8	0	A
400	.8	.8		.4	.8	0	A
700	1.0	.6	.8		0	.2	A
800	.8	.8	.6	.8		.4	A
900	1.0	.6	.8	1.0	.8		
	B	B	B	B	B		

All 15 intercorrelations for the percentage of titles found on three or more lists (labeled B in Table 15) are at .6 or above (and 11 of the 15 are at .8 or above), whereas only four of the correlations for the percentage of titles found on no list are as high as .8 or higher (and the other 11 are no higher than .4 and include all four of zero in the whole table). The mean average intercorrelation in the former half of the table (labeled B) is .8, in the latter (labeled A) .4 . The four correlations of zero all involve either the 800's or the 900's, and the latter class correlates no higher with any other class than .4. It would appear that these groups of libraries are equally strong (or weak) across these six Dewey classes in their holdings of well-recommended titles, but in regard to titles found on no list their performance in these six Dewey classes is uneven.

Table 16 summarizes the recorded experience to date, by subject, with this method of inductive evaluation of public library book collections. Data are shown for over 7800 titles in fiction and eight subject fields. The wide range of values for all nine areas for any one number of lists is not encouraging, but in general about one-quarter of all titles were found on no list, almost 40% on one or two lists, and almost another 40% on three or more lists.

Sec. 8 Summary

This study was undertaken to secure some hard data on the nature and extent of American public library holdings of adult non-fiction books in the humanities. It was obviously necessary to use a sample of libraries and this imposes limita-

Table 16. Percentage Distribution of Titles in Three Studies Using the Inductive Method of Evaluating the Book Collections of Public Libraries

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)	(j)	(k)
No. of Lists	Fiction	Reference Books	Public Health	Phil-osophy	Law	Lang-uages	Art History & Crit.	Liter-ature	His-tory	Arithemtic Average
0	15	29	24	23	27	55	25	13	15	25
1	25	21	20	24	17	14	18	14	13	19
2	35	16	17	19	18	9	21	18	20	19
3	18	12	16	18	25	11	20	22	23	18
4	7	16	13	11	11	8	12	15	18	12
5+	-	6	10	4	2	2	5	18	11	7
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
No.	559	589	317	332	309	269	646	2794	2030	7845

Sources of data: for cols. (b) and (c), Herbert Goldhor, "Analysis of an Inductive Method of Evaluating the Book Collection of a Public Library," Libri 23(1973) p. 16-17; for col. (d), Herbert Goldhor, "Are the Best Books the Most Read?" Library Quarterly 29 (1959) p. 251-55; and for cols. (e)-(j), Table 7 above, pp. 19-20, as corrected (see note c to Table 7) and omitting the data for comparative religion (291-291.9).

tions on the findings. Furthermore the decision was made to use the inductive method of evaluating the books in the libraries in question, and this involves making the assumption that books are "better" when they are listed in ever more of a group of book selection tools and retrospective bibliographies. Finally a test of the accuracy of the 80,000 or more checks of the 6412 titles from the 19 libraries, in more than 15 volumes of up to 12 tools, showed an error of 11% in those checks but not altering the assignment of the test cases to the summary groupings of those found in no, one or two, or three or more tools. In the light of these limitations, five main points summarize the results of this study.

1. About 11% of these public libraries' total book stock consists of adult non-fiction books in the subject areas defined as constituting the humanities; this is equal to 15% of all adult books, and 22% of all adult non-fiction. In absolute terms, this translates into about 41,100,000 volumes, or less than one-third of a volume for each adult served by all US public libraries. Titles in the humanities were 17% of all books published in the US in the years 1972-76. Small libraries in the sample studied had a somewhat lesser percentage of their book stock in the humanities; large libraries a little higher percentage.

2. About 50% of the titles analyzed were found listed in three or more of the tools used, 32% were found in one or two tools, and 16% in none of them. This is a better record than was found in three previous studies which applied this same inductive method of evaluation to public library book collections in other subject areas; and on an absolute basis, it seems to indicate a commendably high

level of good judgment in selecting these titles for purchase. An analysis of the titles found in none of the tools reveals some likely reasons why they were so omitted, e.g. somewhat older books, relative emphasis on subjects less often reviewed, and out-of-the-ordinary subject content.

3. Of the seven main subject areas constituting the humanities in this study, Literature and Historytogether have about three-fourths of all the books, and rank as high or higher in quality than any of the others (as measured by the number of tools in which titles were found listed). Books on history and criticism of the Fine Arts ranked next in quantity (with about 8%) and high in quality. All four other subjects (Philosophy, Comparative Religion, Law, and Languages) each have less than 5% of all the titles and rank lower in quality. Data are available for four of these subjects areas in regard to US book production in 1972-76; these libraries hold rather more books in History and rather less in Literature than were published in those years. In Law and Languages, the two sets of percentages are reasonably close.

4. Of the four main size groups of libraries, Group A (libraries serving less than 25,000 persons each) not only has as many titles in the humanities per person served but also ranks a little better in the quality of titles in the humanities than is true of Group D (libraries serving over 500,000 persons each). Group A libraries have proportionately more juvenile and adult fiction and of course many fewer titles in the humanities than Group D; Literature is a smaller percentage of the total and History a larger percentage than in Group D. But in regard to quality of the titles held, as here defined, Group A libraries compare well with those of any other size in this study.

5. Of all other variables which were considered, two are worthy of mention. About 70% of all 6412 titles were published in the last 20 years (a natural result of public library emphasis on current books), about 20% in the next previous 20 years, and about 10% in all earlier years. This same distribution applies (with some variations) to all seven main subject areas and to all four size groups of libraries. Titles found in none of the tools are a little older than those so found. On the other hand, the number of copies per title increases as one goes from small to large libraries, and is higher in Literature and History than in the other subject areas. Titles found in no tools have only slightly fewer copies each than do titles found in one or more tools.

Footnotes

1. The study was supported by a grant (PD-26935-77-106) from the National Endowment for the Humanities. The present author wishes tc thank the ten persons whc served as research assistants in the study, and especially Rita Bartholomew who was in general charge of collecting the data, and Richard Blue who wrote the programs for the computer analysis of the data.

2. Kenneth E. Beasley, A Statistical Reporting System for Local Public Libraries (Pennsylvania State Library Monographs no. 3; Pennsylvania State University Institute of Public Administration, 1964) p. 17; and Ralph Blasingame, et. al., The Book Collections in the Public Libraries of the Pottsville Library District: A Date and Subject Distribution Study (Pottsville Free Public Library, PA, 1967; ED 019-098) p. 50.

3. See Table 9 of Elizabeth H. Gross, Children's Serivce in Public Libraries: Organization and Administration (ALA, 1963) p. 103.

4. Ernest R. DeProspo et al., Performance Measures for Public Libraries (ALA, 1973).

5. Herbert Goldhor, "Some Lessons from a Statewide Application of Performance Measures for Public Libraries," Illinois Libraries 60 (May 1978) p. 477.

6. Herbert Goldhor, "Analysis of an Inductive Method of Evaluating the Book Collection of a Public Library," Libri 23 (1973) p. 6-17.

7. Taken from the American Library Directory (30th ed., Bowker, 1976).

8. The mean average number of cards per inch was 98, with a range of 80 to 140.

9. On the average, 20 small Pennsylvania public libraries ten years earlier had 43% of all adult books which were fiction; this compares with the figures (in Table 4 for Group A) of 24% of total book stock which is adult fiction, or 37% of all adult books. These Pennsylvania libraries all served populations of less than 25,000 each, and most were in towns of no more then 10,000 people each. See Beasley, op. cit.

10. Marie D. Eldridge, "NCES Survey of Public Libraries," p. 254 of Madeline Miele, et al., eds., The Bowder Annual of Library and Book Trade Information (Bowker, 1976).

11. George Lind, "Characteristics of the U.S. Population Served by Libraries," p. 225 of Miele, ibid.

12. Library of Congress, DDC Additions, Notes, Decisions 3 (April 1975) p. 2, 11-12

13. It happened that we had data for checking the cards of one other library in these two editions (296 and 169 cards respectively); the times per card were 0.8' for the second edition and 0.9' for the first edition.

14. By mistake the computer was programmed to combine the data for 701.18 and for 709-.09; hereafter in this study these two subdivisions are reported as one.

15. Goldhor, Libri, op. cit., p. 16-17

16. Robert D. Leigh, The Public Library in the United States: The General Report of the Public Library Inquiry (Columbia University Press, 1950) p. 79. By "smaller public libraries" Leigh is apparently referring to all those serving less than 25,000 persons each (his types III and IV, ibid., p. 54), which correspond exactly to Group A in this study.

17. Goldhor, Libri, op.cit., p. 16.

18. Eldridge, op. cit., p. 254.

19. Goldhor, Libri, op. cit., p. 14, 15.

20. Blasingame op. cit., p. 54.

21. Goldhor, Libri, op. cit., p. 14, 16.

22. Herbert Goldhor, "Are the Best Books the Most Read?", Library Quarterly 29 (1959) p. 254.

23. Goldhor, Libri, op. cit., p. 13.

Appendix 1. Dewey Decimal Classes for Subject Areas in the Humanities as Used in This Study

I. 100-199 Philosophy (excluding 130-39 and 150-59)
- a.100-09 General works on philosophy
- b.110-19 Metaphysics
- c.120-29 Knowledge, cause and purpose
- d.140-49 Specificphilosophic viewpoints
- e.160-69 Logic
- d.170-79 Ethics
- g.180-89 Ancient, medieval and oriental philosophy
- h.190-99 Modern western philosophy

II. 291-291.09 Comparative Religion

III. 340-349 Law

IV. 400-499 Languages
- a.400-09 General works on language
- b.410-19 Linguistics
- c.420-29 English and Anglo-Saxon languages
- d.430-39 German and other Germanic languages
- e.440-49 French, Provencal, and Catalan
- f.450-59 Italian and Romanian
- g.460-69 Spanish and Portuguese
- h.470-79 Latin
- i.480-89 Greek
- j.490-99 Other languages

V. Fine and Decorative Arts (history and criticism only#)
- a.701.18 Criticism and appreciation - theory, technique, history
- b.709-709.9 Fine and decorative arts (general) - historical and geographical treatment
- c.720.9 Architecture - historical and geographical treatment
- d.730.9-730.92 Sculpture - historical and geographical treatment
- e.741.09-741.092 Drawing - historical and geographical treatment
- f.759-759.99 Painting - historical and geographical treatment
- g.769.9-769.99 Printmaking - historical and geographical treatment
- h.770.9-770.92 Photography - historical and geographical treatment
- i.780.9-780.99 Music - historical and geographical treatment
- j.792.09 Theater (stage) - historical and geographical treatment

VI. 800-899 Literature
- a.800-09 General works on literature; rhetoric; theory, technique and history of literary criticism
- b.810-19 American literature
- c.820-29 Literature of English and Anglo-Saxon languages
- d.830-39 Literature of German and other Germanic languages
- e.840-49 French, Provencal, and Catalan literature

f.850-59 Italian and Romanian literature
g.860-69 Spanish and Portuguese literature
h.870-79 Latin literature
i.880-89 Classical and modern Greek literature
j.890-99 Literature of other languages

VII. 900-999 History (excluding 910-929)
a.900-09 General works on history
b.913.031 Archaeology
c.930-39 History of the ancient world to 500 AD
d.940-49 European history from the fall of Rome to the present
e.950-59 History of Asia
f.960-69 History of Africa
g.970-79 History of North America
h.980-89 History of South America
i.990-99 History of other parts of the world

Source: Dewey Decimal Classification and Relative Index (18th ed.; Forest Press, 1971)

#It was difficult to separate out these facets of the 700's, partly because there are so many sub-disciplines and partly because history and criticism are not always uniquely identified. We decided to select one number or group of consecutive numbers from each second summary category and not try to be more complete or comprehensive.